



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Shabbos, Daf נט – Daf טז

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
v'l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf נט---71-----

- In the previous Gemara **Rava** said that the chatas brought for the cutting of the second set of melachos exempts the need to bring a separate chatas for the cutting of the first set of melachos, since they are the same melacha (cutting). Also, once the chatas is effective on the cutting of the first set, it is effective for the grinding melacha of the first set as well through “greira” (“pulling along”). (However, it does not help for the grinding of the second set of melachos).
 - **Q:** We learned that if someone eats 3 olive sized pieces of cheilev and the first 2 were eaten in the same period of unawareness and the last 2 were eaten in the same period of unawareness (he became aware of eating the first piece before he ate the third piece), **Rava** says, if he brings a chatas on the first piece, it is effective for the second as well (but not for the 3rd, because he does not hold of “greira”). If he brings a chatas for the third piece, it is effective for the second as well. If he brings a chatas for the second piece it is effective for all three. **Abaye** says, when he brings a chatas on any one them, it is effective for all 3 (because of “greira”). We see that **Rava** does NOT hold of “greira”?! **A:** After he heard the concept of “greira” from **Abaye** in this case, he agreed with it.
 - **Q:** If **Rava** now holds of “greira”, why is the chatas not effective for the grinding of the second set as well?! **A:** **Rava** holds of “greira” which is why the chatas for the second cutting helps for the grinding of the first set (through “greira” from the cutting of the first set). However, he does not hold of “greira” from something which itself came about through “greira” (the grinding of the second set of melachos cannot be included through “greira” via the first grinding, because the first grinding itself came about through “greira” via the first cutting).
- This issue that is agreed to by **Abaye** and **Rava** (that one chatas is effective for two of the same melachos even though one was done with an unawareness of Shabbos and the other with an unawareness of the melacha) was posed as a question by **R' Zeira**. He asked, if one cuts or grinds half the amount needed to be oiver on Shabbos, because he was unaware that it was Shabbos, and then he cuts or grinds another half of the amount needed to be oiver, but this time because he was unaware that the melacha was assur, do those 2 half amounts combine to one, large amount and thereby require the person to bring a chatas? **R' Assi** answered, since they are separate for chatas purposes, they cannot be combined to become one large melacha.
 - **Q:** Is it correct that if 2 things are considered separate for their chatas obligations they cannot be combined to create a minimum amount? A Mishna says, if one ate two half-olive sized pieces of cheilev in one period of unawareness, they combine and require that a chatas be brought. **Reish Lakish** in the Gemara explains that the chiddush is that these 2 half-olive sized pieces were prepared in different ways and the Mishna follows **R' Yehoshua**, who says that if pieces of the same item (e.g. cheilev) are prepared in 2 different ways (one is cooked and one is roasted), they are considered two, separate entities and would require 2 chatas. This means, that even according to **R' Yehoshua**, although the pieces have separate chatas liabilities, the Mishna says that they combine to create the minimum required amount!? **A:** **Reish Lakish** did not say the explanation on the part of the Mishna that says that they **do** combine. He said his explanation on the part of the Mishna that says when one has 2 half-olive sized pieces of 2 different foods, they do **not** combine. On that, **Reish Lakish** says, the 2 different foods referred to here are both cheilev, just prepared in different ways, and this goes according to **R' Yehoshua** who says that they will not combine. They don't combine for chatas liability or for the minimum required amount.
 - According to this answer, the first part of the Mishna which says that 2 of the same foods that are half-olive sized do combine, refers to where they were prepared the same way as well. **R' Huna** says that the chiddush is that even if after eating the first half-olive sized piece he realizes what he did, that “realization” does not prevent the second half-olive sized piece from

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

combining with the first one to make a complete olive-sized piece. This is because we are following **R' Gamliel** who says that a “realization” only has significance if it is a realization on a complete amount, not when it is on less than a complete amount.

- If one ate 2 olive-sized pieces of cheilev in one period of unawareness, and he was made aware of eating the first piece, and then was made aware of his eating the second piece, there is a machlokes regarding what he must do. **R' Yochanan** says he must bring 2 separate chataos, because the pasuk says “Ahl Chataso V'heivi” (“for his sin he shall bring a chatas”), which means that he must bring a separate chatas for each aveirah that he does. **Reish Lakish** says he only needs to bring one chatas, because the pasuk says “**Mei'** chataso V'nislach Lo” (“from his sin and it will be forgiven for him”), which means even if the chatas is brought for only some of his aveiros, he is totally forgiven for all aveiros.
 - **Reish Lakish** says that **R' Yochanan's** pasuk refers to after the chatas was already offered. **Reish Lakish** agrees, that if he finds out about his eating the second piece after the chatas has been offered, he must bring a second chatas.
 - **R' Yochanan** says that **Reish Lakish's** pasuk refers to a case where one ate one and a half olive-sized pieces of cheilev, then became aware that he ate one olive-sized piece, and then he ate a second half-olive sized piece. We would have thought that the two half-olive sized pieces should combine together and make him chayuv for a chatas. The pasuk tells us that the chatas for the first olive sized piece is effective for the first half-olive sized piece as well.
- **Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, do **R' Yochanan** and **Reish Lakish** argue only before the chatas was actually separated, and it is then that **Reish Lakish** says the chatas helps to atone for both aveiros, but **R' Yochanan** says, once there is an awareness the aveiros become distinct entities, each needing its own korbon, but, if the second aveirah is discovered after the chatas is separated even **Reish Lakish** would agree that 2 chataos are required. Or, maybe they argue even if the second aveirah is discovered after the chatas has been separated, and **Reish Lakish** says that even then only one chatas is needed and only after the korbon has been offered is a second chatas needed, and **R' Yochanan** says that once the chatas has been separated, it can no longer be effective for an aveirah that has been discovered after that? Or maybe, they argue in both cases? **R' Ashi** said, it makes sense that they argue in both cases. If they only argue before the separation of the chatas, but after the separation **Reish Lakish** agrees with **R' Yochanan**, then why did **Reish Lakish** explain **R' Yochanan's** pasuk as referring to after the korbon had been offered? He should have explained that it is referring to after it was separated?! And, if they argue after the separation, but before that **R' Yochanan** agrees to **Reish Lakish**, why did **R' Yochanan** explain **Reish Lakish's** pasuk as referring to the case of one and half olive-sized pieces, why didn't he just say that it is referring to before the separation of the korbon?
 - The Gemara says, **R' Ashi's** points are not valid, because it could be that the Gemara that offered the explanations of the psukim wasn't sure itself as to the machlokes and offered these explanations in case the machlokes is even in the extreme cases. Therefore, a proof can't be brought from the way that the psukim were explained.

-----Daf עב--72-----

- **Ulla** said, according to **R' Tarfon** who says that one need not have definite knowledge of wrongdoing to bring an “asham vadai” (a definite asham, as opposed to an “asham talui” which is brought for possibly being oiver an aveirah), if one is mezaneh with a “shifcha charufah” (a slavewoman who was designated to marry a particular slave, with whom an act of znus requires that an asham be brought) multiple times b'shogeg, even over different periods of unawareness, he only needs to bring one asham. **R' Tarfon** can be said to hold this way, because he says that knowledge is not critical for a definite asham, which means that he holds that knowledge is not significant with regard to ashamos. If so, knowledge will also not separate the acts of znus to make them be chayuv in multiple ashamos.
 - **Q: R' Hamnuna** asked, if one were to be mezaneh with this shifcha, designate an animal for an asham, and then say to the Kohen, “Do not offer the korbon yet, because I am going to be mezaneh with her again”, are you telling me that one asham would suffice in this case as well? **A: Ulla** answered, an act

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

done after designation of the animal is certainly different than an act done after knowledge. An act done after designation would definitely require an additional asham.

- **R' Dimi** said, according to **R' Akiva** who says that one needs to have definite knowledge of wrongdoing to bring an “asham vadai”, if one is mezaneh with a “shifcha charufah” multiple times b’shogeg, over different periods of unawareness, he needs to bring multiple ashamos. **R' Akiva** can be said to hold this way, because he says that knowledge is critical for a definite asham, which means that he holds that knowledge is significant with regard to ashamos. If so, knowledge will also separate the acts of znus to make them be chayuv in multiple ashamos.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, with regard to a chatas, knowledge is certainly required for it to be effective, and yet we have a machlokes between **R' Yochanan** and **Reish Lakish** whether or not knowledge separates acts done b’shogeg to require multiple chataos. **Reish Lakish** says that only one chatas would be required, and would therefore say that only one asham would be required in this case as well!? **A: R' Dimi** remained quiet. **Abaye** said, maybe you are being quiet because you were referring to a case where the acts were done after designation of the asham, in which case even **Reish Lakish** would agree that multiple ashamos are required. **R' Dimi** said, that was what he was referring to.
- **Ravin** said 3 statements: 1) All agree that sometimes multiple acts of znus with the shifcha require only one asham (like **Ulla** said, that according to **R' Tarfon** even **R' Yochanan** would agree that since knowledge is not significant for ashamos, knowledge will not necessitate multiple ashamos); 2) All agree that sometimes multiples acts of znus with the shifcha require multiple ashamos (even **Reish Lakish** would agree that acts done after designation of an animal for the asham require an additional asham); 3) There is a disagreement regarding the case of the shifcha (according to **R' Akiva** who holds that knowledge is significant with regard to ashamos, **R' Yochanan** would say that knowledge between acts would separate the acts for asham liability, and **Reish Lakish** would say that knowledge never separates acts for separate korbon liability).
- If one intended to lift a knife from the ground, and as he was lifting it he cut produce off the ground, he is patur (because he wasn't even intending to cut anything, so it is not even called a shogeg). If one intended to cut an item which was detached from the ground and he mistakenly cut something that was attached to the ground, **Rava** says he is patur (because he did not intend to cut something which was assur), and **Abaye** says he is chayuv a chatas (because he did intend to cut something).
 - **Rava** brings a proof from a Braisa which says, 1) Shabbos is more stringent than other mitzvos in that one who is oiver Shabbos twice in one period of unawareness is chayuv 2 chataos, but with other mitzvos, one who is oiver twice in one such period is only chayuv one chatas. 2) On the other hand, other mitzvos are more stringent than Shabbos in that one who is oiver other mitzvos b’shogeg without any intent is still chayuv a chatas. One who is oiver Shabbos b’shogeg and without any intent is patur.
 - The Gemara tries to explain the Braisa before discussing the point it was brought down for. In the first part of the Braisa, what are the “other mitzvos” that one can be oiver twice and only be chayuv one chatas? It can't be that he ate cheilev and blood, because then he would be chayuv 2 chataos. It can't be where he ate 2 pieces of cheilev and that's why he is only chayuv one chatas, because the comparable to Shabbos would be where he does the melacha of “cutting” twice, in which case he would only be chayuv one as well!? Rather, the case refers to avodah zarah. If he worships an avodah zarah in a few ways, he is still only chayuv one chatas.
 - This must mean that the second part of the Braisa is also discussing avoda zarah. That would mean that one who does avodah zarah b’shogeg and without any intention is chayuv. How is that so? If he bowed down to an avoda zarah thinking it was a shul and he had in mind to bow to Hashem, he would not be chayuv! If he bowed to a statue of the king, if he accepted it as a god, he is a meizid. If he didn't, then it is not avodah zarah at all! If it is talking about where he bowed to an idol out of love or fear for someone else, and that's when he is chayuv, that only follows **Abaye** who says one is chayuv in such a case, but according to **Rava**, this person would not be chayuv! If we say it is discussing where one thought it is permitted to worship idols, and he is still chayuv, that would mean that the Braisa is saying that if someone thought he is allowed to be mechalel Shabbos he would be totally patur. That is not true! We discussed whether one

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

who didn't know that it was Shabbos is chayuv one or many chataos, but totally patur was never a thought.

- It must be that when the first part of the Braisa discusses “other mitzvos” it refers to avoda zarah and the “other mitzvos” in the second part of the Braisa refers to some mitzvos other than avoda zarah. For example, when someone thought he was eating kosher fats and ate cheilev, he will be chayuv. But, with regard to Shabbos he is patur. That must mean that if he intends to cut a detached plant and cuts an attached plant, he would be patur. That would be a proof to **Rava!**
 - **Abaye** would say that the “other mitzvos” referred to in the second part of the Braisa refers to where one thought he was swallowing saliva and it turned out to be liquid cheilev, and he is chayuv. However with regard to Shabbos he would be patur – meaning that if he picked up a knife and unintentionally cut an attached plant as he was lifting the knife, he is patur. However, if he intended to cut a detached item and mistakenly cut something that was attached to the ground, he would be chayuv.

-----Daf לל---73-----

- If one has in mind to throw an object 2 amos in reshus harabim and mistakenly throws it 4 amos, **Rava** says he is patur (he did not intend to throw it 4 amos), and **Abaye** says he is chayuv (he intended to perform the act of throwing).
- If one threw an object 4 amos because he thought he was in a reshus hayachid, but he was in fact in a reshus harabim, **Rava** says he is patur (he did not intend to throw something in a prohibited way), and **Abaye** says he is chayuv (he intended to perform the act of throwing).
- We have now listed 3 similar cases (the 2 here and the one where someone cut an attached item when he had in mind to cut a detached item) where **Abaye** and **Rava** have the same machlokes. It is necessary to list all 3 cases. If we would have only said the first case (with cutting the attached item), we would say that **Rava** only declares him patur there because he did not intend to do a cutting which is in any way prohibited. However, in the second case, by throwing 4 amos his intention takes place (he threw it 2 amos, and it went further) so maybe he should be chayuv. That's why we have to list the second case as well. If we would not say the third case, we would say in that case he is chayuv because he fully intended to throw the object 4 amos. That's why we list the third case to teach us that **Rava** says he is patur in that case as well.
- **Q:** A Mishna says that there are 39 “avos melachos”. **R' Yochanan** explains that the reason the Mishna stated the number 39 (we could just count the list of avos melachos that the Mishna goes on to mention) is to teach that, although there are many more than 39 prohibited melachos, they all fit into 39 groups (avos melachos) and therefore, the maximum number of chataos that can potentially have to be brought is 39 (if someone is oiver each of the 39 melachos groups). The only way this can happen is if someone knows it is Shabbos and he does all of the melachos b'shogeg. According to **Abaye** this makes sense, because it could be talking about where the person knows it is Shabbos and meant to do the melachos in a way that it is less than the minimum required measurement, but he mistakenly did the full shiur. According to **Abaye** he is chayuv for doing so. However, according to **Rava**, he is not chayuv for mistakenly doing the full shiur, so the only way we can have a case where one would be chayuv for 39 melachos is according to **R' Yochanan**, because the person can be aware of Shabbos by knowing that all 39 melachos are prohibited, and can still be chayuv a chatas by not realizing that these melachos carry a kares penalty. However, according to **Reish Lakish**, that one is only chayuv a chatas if he was unaware that the act was prohibited, how is it possible that someone is aware of Shabbos but unaware of all 39 melachos? In what regard is he aware of Shabbos? **A:** He holds like **R' Akiva** who says that the halacha of techumin is D'Oraisa, although not one of the 39 melachos. Based on this, the person can be aware of Shabbos with regard to the din of techumin, but not with regard to any of the 39 melachos.

MISHNA

- There are 39 avos melachos: zoreah (seeding), choreish (plowing), kotzer (cutting), me'amer (gathering), dash (threshing), zoreh (winnowing), borer (selecting), tochen (grinding), miraked (sifting), lash (kneading), ofeh (baking), gozez (shearing), milaben (whitening), minapetz (beating), tzoveah (dyeing), toveh (spinning), meiseich

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

(setting the threads in a weaving machine), making the batei nirin, weaving 2 threads, removing 2 threads, koisher (knotting), matir (opening knots), sewing 2 stitches, ripping in order to sew 2 stitches, trapping, slaughtering, skinning, salting the skin, tanning, smoothing, cutting, writing two letters, erasing in order to write 2 letters, building, demolishing, extinguishing, lighting a fire, makeh b'patish (making the final blow), and transferring from one reshus to another. These are the avos melachos – forty minus one.

GEMARA

- **R' Yochanan** explains, the reason the Mishna tells us the number (39), when we could just count on our own, is to teach us that if one does all 39 b'shogeg in one period of unawareness, he is chayuv 39 chataos.

HA'ZOREAH V'HACHORESH

- **Q:** Plowing is done before seeding, so why is it not listed that way in the Mishna? **A:** The Tanna was in Eretz Yisrael, where they would plow after seeding because the land was very hard and would be plowed a second time after the seeding (this plowing is also included in the av melacha of seeding).
- A Braisa says that seeding, pruning, planting trees and grafting are all the same melacha. The chiddush is that if one does them all, they are all one melacha and he is chayuv only one chatas.
- **R' Acha in the name of R' Chiya bar Ashi in the name of R' Ami** said, that grafting is included in zoreah. **Q:** Why is it not included in "planting trees"? **A:** It is included in zoreah as well as in planting trees.
- **R' Kahana** said, one who prunes and needs the wood is chayuv for "cutting" and for "planting". **R' Yosef** said, one who cuts "aspasta" is chayuv for cutting and for planting. **Abaye** says, one who cuts beets is chayuv for cutting and for planting.

V'HACHORESH

- A Braisa says, plowing, digging, and making grooves are all the same melacha.
- **R' Sheishes** said, one who removes a mound of dirt from his house is chayuv for building. If he does so in a field, he is chayuv for plowing.
- **Rava** said, if one fills a hole in his house he is chayuv for building. If he does it in the field he is chayuv for plowing.
- **R' Abba** said, one who digs in his house because he needs the dirt is patur (because he doesn't need the actual melacha, which is the digging, he just needs the dirt). This is true even according to **R' Yehuda** who says that one is chayuv for a "melacha she'eina tzricha l'gufah", because he only says that when he is accomplishing a positive. Here, the digging is ruining the house, so he would be patur.

V'HAKOTZER

- A Braisa says, cutting all different kinds of fruits is considered to be kotzer.
- **R' Pappa** said, one who throws a clump of earth at a date tree and knocks off dates is chayuv for 2 melachos – cutting and "mefarek" (which is like threshing) because he is removing the dates from their outer layer. **R' Ashi** says the person would be patur, because this is not the normal way of cutting or of "mefarek".

V'HAME'AMER

- **Rava** said, one who collects salt from the drying ditches where sea salt is dried, is chayuv for "me'amer". **Abaye** says one is only chayuv for "me'amer" for something which is grown from the ground.

V'HADASH

- A Braisa says, threshing, beating flax, and beating cotton are all one melacha.

HA'ZOREH, HA'BORER, V'HA'TOCHEN, V'HA'MIRAKED

- **Q:** "Winnowing", "selecting" and "sifting" are all the same melacha, so why are they mentioned separately? **A:** **Abaye** and **Rava** explain, anything done in the Mishkan is considered an av melacha, even if there are a few which are essentially the same thing.
 - **Q:** Why doesn't the Mishna list "kosesh" (pounding to separate) as well since this is something that was done in the Mishkan? **A:** **Abaye** explains, poor people eat without doing "kosesh" on their bread, so it is not something that is done by everybody.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, if one has a mix of foods in front of him on Shabbos, he may pick out a food (“borer”) and eat it, and he may pick out a food for others to eat, but he may not pick out any one food, and if he does, he is chayuv a chatas.
 - **Q:** This Braisa is contradictory! First it says one can pick a food, then it says that he cannot!? **A:** **Ulla** says, the Braisa means that one may pick a food from the mixture to eat that day, but not to put away for the next day.
 - **Q: R’ Chisda** asks, no other melacha is mutar if done for Shabbos but assur for the next day (e.g., baking is not mutar if done for Shabbos), so why would this be different?! **A:** Rather, **R’ Chisda** says it means one may do “borer” less than the shiur, but not more than the shiur.
 - **Q: R’ Yosef** asks, no other melacha is mutar less than the shiur (e.g., baking is not mutar if done less than the shiur), so why would this be different?! **A:** Rather **R’ Yosef** says, it means one may do “borer” by hand, but using a funnel or a plate is patur, but assur. If one uses a sifter, he is chayuv a chatas.
 - **Q: R’ Hamnuna** asks, the Braisa doesn’t make any mention of a funnel or a plate!? **A:** Rather, **R’ Hamnuna** says, it means that one may do “borer” by taking the good from the bad, but not the bad from the good.
 - **Q: Abaye** asks, the Braisa doesn’t say anything about the good and the bad?! **A:** Rather, **Abaye** says, it means that he may do “borer” for immediate consumption, but not for consumption later on that day.
 - **Rava** said, **Abaye** is correct in his explanation of the Braisa.
- If one had a mixture of 2 foods in front of him and he was “borer” one of them, **R’ Ashi** says he is patur (but it is assur) and **R’ Yirmiya** says he is chayuv a chatas.
 - **Q:** How does **R’ Ashi** say patur? The Braisa said he is chayuv!? **A:** **R’ Ashi** is discussing using a funnel or plate and the Braisa is discussing using a sifter.
- **R’ Dimi** said, it was the Shabbos of **R’ Bibi**, and **R’ Ami** and **R’ Assi** were visiting. **R’ Bibi** threw a basket of fruits in front of everyone, but **R’ Dimi** was not sure if he did so because it was a mixture and he didn’t want to choose, or if he did so because he wanted to show that he was giving generously.
- **Chizkiya** said, one who takes “turmusim” (a type of bean) from their shell is chayuv. It could be he typically says choosing the good from the bad is ok, but turmusim are different because they must be cooked 7 times to be edible. Therefore, until it is cooked that many times, it is considered like picking the bad, which is prohibited.

V’HATOCHEN

- **R’ Pappa** says, one who chops beets into small pieces is chayuv for “tochen”.
- **R’ Menashe** says, one who chops wood into thin pieces is chayuv for “tochen”. **R’ Ashi** says, if he is particular about the size of the pieces, he is also chayuv for “mechatech” (cutting).

V’HALUSH, V’HA’OFEH

- **Q: R’ Pappa** asks, why did the Mishna list “baking” (which includes “cooking”) and not list it as “cooking”, which is what was done in the Mishkan (baking was not done in the construction of the Mishkan)?! **A:** The Mishna was listing the processes involved in the making of bread, so it lists the melacha as “baking”.
- **R’ Acha bar R’ Avira** said, if someone throws a peg into an oven to harden it, he is chayuv for “cooking”, because it first gets soft and then gets hard (getting soft is “cooking”).
- **Rabbah bar R’ Huna** said, one who heats pitch is chayuv for cooking, although it eventually hardens, the temporary softening is enough to be chayuv for cooking.
- **Rava** said, one who makes an earthenware barrel is chayuv 7 chataos (grinding the earth, borer of the pebbles, sifting the earth, kneading the earth with water, smoothing the earth, lighting an oven, baking the barrel). One who makes an oven is chayuv 8 chataos (the same 7 plus he was “makeh b’patish”).
- **Abaye** said, one who makes a basket for reeds is chayuv 11 chataos (cutting, planting, gathering, borer, smoothing, grinding, mechatech, meisech, setting up 2 batei nirin, weaving and makeh b’patish). If he sews the opening closed he is chayuv 13 chataos (same 11 plus sewing and tying).

HAGOZEZ ESS HATZEMER V’HAMILABNO

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, one who spins the wool from the back of an animal is chayuv 3 chataos: gozez (shearing), menapetz (beating) and toveh (spinning).
 - **R' Kahana** says this is not the normal method of performing any of these melachos and he is therefore not chayuv for any of them.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that they spun the hair on the goats when they built the Mishkan?! **A:** Those people were very skilled. Normal people do not do that, so it is not the normal method.
- A Braisa says, one who plucks a feather, cuts off the top, and pulls off its hairs is chayuv 3 chataos. **Reish Lakish** explains, the melachos are gozez, michatech, and mimachek (smoothing), respectively.

HAKOISHER V'HAMATIR

- **Q:** Where was “keshira” (tying) done in the Mishkan?
 - **Rava** says the curtains were tied down to the pegs.
 - **Q:** That was a tying that was meant to be untied?!
 - **Abaye** says the weavers would tie threads that ripped.
 - **Rava** asks, that is tying, but where did they do untying? It can't be that if there were multiple knots near each other they would untie them and join them into one knot because that would leave holes which would not be done for the curtains in the Mishkan!?
 - Rather, **Rava** says, the tying and untying was done by the catchers of the “chilazon” fish.

V'HATOFER SHTEI TEFIROS

- **Q:** Two stitches alone would not last!? **A:** **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said that the Mishna is referring to where he ties the threads after performing the two stitches.

-----Daf תע--75-----

HAKOREYAH AHL MINAS LITFOR

- **Q:** Where was “tearing” done in the Mishkan? **A:** **Rabba and R' Zeira** say, if a curtain got a hole, they would tear off the surrounding material and sew it back together.
- **R' Zutra bar Tuvia in the name of Rav** said: if someone pulls a loose thread and thereby tightens two pieces together, he is chayuv a chatas for sewing; one who learns from a “magush” – a heretic, is liable to death; one who knows how to figure the seasons and constellations and does not do so, we may not talk to him.
 - There is a machlokes between **Rav and Shmuel** whether “magushta” means one who does “kishuf” or one who is a heretic. From this statement of **Rav**, we see that **Rav** is the one who says that “magushta” is a heretic.
 - **R' Shimon ben Pazi in the name of R' Yehoshua ben Levi in the name of Bar Kappara** said, one who knows how to figure the seasons and constellations and does not do so, the pasuk says such a person seems not interested in learning the ways of Hashem.
 - **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini in the name of R' Yonasan** said, from a pasuk we see that it is a mitzvah to figure the seasons and the constellations.

HATZAD TZVI...

- A Braisa says, if one traps a chilazon fish and squeezes out its blood by hand, he is only chayuv one chatas. **R' Yehuda** says he is chayuv 2 chataos, because squeezing out the blood is a toldah of threshing. **Rava** explains, the **Rabanan (T”K)** say it is not a toldah of threshing, because threshing only applies to something that comes from the ground.
 - **Q:** He should be chayuv another chatas for killing the fish? **A1:** **R' Yochanan** says we are discussing a case where the fish was already dead. **A2:** **Rava** says, even if the fish was alive, the killing was done totally unintentionally (he just wanted the blood), so he is not chayuv a chatas for that.
 - **Q:** Even if it is unintentional, it is a “psik reisha”, in which case even **R' Shimon** would agree that he should be chayuv!? **A:** He doesn't want the fish to die, because the blood is clearer as long as the fish is alive. Therefore, although it is a “psik reisha”, since he doesn't want it to happen, he is not chayuv.

V'HASHOCHTO

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Why is one chayuv for slaughtering? **A: Rav** says because he is dyeing the area around the neck with blood. **Shmuel** says because he is killing.
 - The Gemara explains that **Rav** means he is *also* chayuv for dyeing, but he surely holds that he is chayuv for killing as well.
 - **Rav** explains, the slaughterer wants this area dyed from the blood because it shows potential customers how fresh the meat is.

V'HAMOLCHO V'HAME'ABDO

- **Q:** Salting is part of the tanning process, so it is one and the same?! **A: R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish** say to remove one of these from the list and insert "sirtut" (making lines to cut) in its place.
- **Rabbah bar R' Huna** says, one who salts meat (which **R' Ashi** explains means he salts it heavily to preserve it) is chayuv for "tanning". **Rava** says there is no "tanning" on food.

V'HAMIMACHKO V'HAMICHATCHO

- **R' Acha bar Chanina** says, one who walks around pillars to smooth the ground around them is chayuv for "mimachek" (smoothing).
- **R' Chiya bar Abba** said, **R' Ashi** told me 3 things in the name of **R' Yehoshua ben Levi**: one who sharpens the tops of poles is chayuv for "mechatech"; one who smoothes medicine onto a wound is chayuv for "memachek"; one who smoothes or polishes a stone is chayuv for "makeh b'patish".
- **R' Shimon ben Kisma in the name of Reish Lakish** said, one who engraves a keili (of the type which is normally engraved) or blows glass is chayuv for "makeh b'patish".
 - **R' Yehuda** says, one who removes the hanging threads from a garment is chayuv for "makeh b'patish". But, this is only when it bothers him that they are hanging there.

V'HAKOSEV SHTEI OSIYOS

- A Braisa says, if one writes a large letter in enough space to write 2 letters, he is patur. If he erases that large letter, he is chayuv. **R' Menachem the son of R' Yose** said, this is a chumrah of erasing over writing.

HA'BONEH, V'HASOSER, HAMICHABEH, V'HAMAVIR, V'HAMAKEH B'PATISH

- **Rabbah and R' Zeira** say, any act that is a finishing act is considered to be "makeh b'patish".

EILU AVOS MELACHOS

- "Eilu" ("these are") comes to exclude the shita of **R' Eliezer** who says that one is chayuv a separate chatas for doing an av melacha and its own toldah.

CHASEIR ACHAS

- This comes to exclude the shita of **R' Yehuda**, who adds separating the threads on the weaving machine and hitting the threads as two additional avos melachos. Our Mishna holds that those two are considered "meiseich" and "oreg", respectively.

MISHNA

- They stated another rule: something that is typically used by people (and therefore stored) and people store this item in a given amount, and then one walks into the reshus harabim carrying that given amount of this item, he is chayuv a chatas for carrying. Something that is not typically used and stored by people, and not stored in the quantity that this person happens to be storing it in, only the one who stored it in this quantity is chayuv if he carries out that amount.

GEMARA

- The Mishna's term "typically used by people": **R' Pappa** says is excluding blood of a niddah, **Mar Ukva** says is excluding the wood of an "asheira" tree (a tree used for avodah zara which must be destroyed).
 - **R' Pappa** surely agrees with **Mar Ukva**. **Mar Ukva** may not agree with **R' Pappa** because blood can be given to a cat to eat. **R' Pappa** says that one would not give blood to a cat to eat, because if a cat eats blood, the person who is the source of that blood becomes weak.
- **R' Yose bar Chanina** says, our Mishna does not follow **R' Shimon**, because **R' Shimon** says that even if most people store an item in a particular quantity, only the ones who store it in that amount are chayuv for carrying it outside.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

V'CHOL SHE'EINO KASHER L'HATZNIAH

- **R' Elazar** says, this part of the Mishna does not follow **R' Shimon ben Elazar**, because he says in a Braisa that even if most people don't store a certain item or they do but in a larger amount than a particular person does, if someone takes that item in that lesser quantity from this particular person's house and goes outside with it, he is chayuv (the Mishna said that only the particular person himself is chayuv).

-----Daf 76-----

MISHNA

- If one carries the following amounts of the following items into reshus harabim, he is chayuv a chatas
 - Straw in the amount of a cow's mouthful.
 - "Eitzah" in the amount of a camel's mouthful.
 - Straw which has not been processed in the amount of a young sheep's mouthful.
 - Grass in the amount of a young goat's mouthful.
 - Garlic leaves and onion leaves: if they are moist, in the amount of a dried fig; if they are dry, in the amount of a young goat's mouthful.
- These items cannot combine with each other since they all have different "shiurim".

GEMARA

- **Q:** What is "eitzah"? **A:** **R' Yehuda** explains it is the straw that grows with beans.
- **R' Dimi** came to Bavel and said, if one carries out straw for a *camel* in the amount of a cow's mouthful, originally **R' Yochanan** said he is chayuv and **Reish Lakish** said he is patur. But, the next morning **R' Yochanan** retracted and said that he is patur.
 - **R' Yosef** said, **R' Yochanan** was correct to retract his opinion, because straw is not fit for a camel, so one should not be chayuv for taking it out for a camel.
 - **Abaye** said, **R' Yochanan's** original opinion was correct, because that amount of straw is fit for a cow, so he should be chayuv for carrying that amount out.
 - **Ravin** came to Bavel and said, if one carries out straw for a *camel* in the amount of a cow's mouthful, all agree that he is chayuv, like **Abaye** said. The machlokes is if one takes out a cow's mouthful (which is smaller than a camel's mouthful) of "eitzah" for a cow. **R' Yochanan** says he is patur because cows only eat "eitzah" when there is no other choice ("shas hadchak") and that is not called a normal "eating". **Reish Lakish** says he is chayuv, because although it is not typical, it is called an "eating" and therefore he is chayuv for carrying it.

AMIR K'MLO PI TILEH

- **Q:** A Braisa says that the amount for "amir" is a dried fig?! **A:** A young goat's mouthful and a dried fig are the same size.

ALEI SHUM V'ALEI BITZALIM...V'EIN MITZTARFIN ZEH IHM ZEH...

- **R' Yose bar Chanina** says, the items that need larger amounts cannot combine with the items that need smaller amounts for the purpose of reaching the smaller amounts. However, the items that one is chayuv for taking out a smaller amount can combine with items that require larger amounts to reach those larger amounts.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that different materials combine for the shiur of tumah only because there are times that they are used together (in the saddle of a donkey). However, the different animal feeds are never mixed together, so why should they combine for the shiur? **A:** **Rava** explains, the different feeds are displayed together by a seller showing samples of his product selection. Therefore, they can combine to make the shiur.

MISHNA

- If one carries food fit for human consumption that is the size of a dried fig into the reshus harabim, he is chayuv. All foods combine to this shiur, because they all share the same shiur. The following parts of food do not

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

combine to reach this shiur: the shells, pits, stems, shells of wheat that is left after pounding, and shells of wheat that is left after sifting.

- **R' Yehuda** says that shells of lentils do combine with the food, because they get cooked with the lentils and get eaten along with them.

GEMARA

- **Q:** A Mishna says that the shells of wheat do combine to create the minimum shiur necessary to establish a chiyuv to separate challah? **A: Abaye** said, since poor people make bread with those shells in it, it is considered part of the bread and creates a challah obligation. However, it is not considered significant enough to create a chiyuv on Shabbos.

R' YEHUDA OMER CHUTZ M'KLIPEI ADASHIM HAMISBASHLOS IMAHEN

- **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** says shells of lentils and other beans combine!? **A:** The shells of fresh beans are edible and therefore combine to reach the shiur, and those are the beans that the Braisa is referring to.
 - **R' Avahu** explains, shells of older beans look like flies and therefore no one would eat them.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK KLAL GADOL!!!

PEREK HAMOTZI YAYIN – PEREK SHMINI

MISHNA

- If one carries the following amounts of the following liquids into reshus harabim, he is chayuv a chatas:
 - Wine in the amount that when it is diluted it fills a full cup.
 - Milk in the amount of a full swallow.
 - Honey in the amount needed to put on the wound which is found on the backs of horses and camels.
 - Oil in the amount needed to anoint a small limb.
 - Water in the amount needed to prepare an eye solution.
 - All other liquids in the amount of a “revi’is” (a quarter of a log).
 - Spoiled (stagnant) or waste water in the amount of a revi’is.
- **R' Shimon** says one is chayuv for carrying out all liquids in the amount of a revi’is. These other shiurim listed are for people who store these liquids in amounts less than a revi’is.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says the cup of wine referred to in the Mishna is cup of wine used for “bentching”.
 - **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuhah** said that such a cup needs a quarter of a revi’is of undiluted wine, so that when you add 3 parts water to 1 part wine, you have a cup of diluted wine equal to a revi’is.

-----Daf ת"ז---77-----

GEMARA

- A Braisa says the cup of wine referred to in the Mishna is a cup of wine used for “bentching”.
 - **Rabbah bar Avuhah** says that such a cup needs a quarter of a revi’is of undiluted wine, so that when you add 3 parts water to 1 part wine, you have a cup of diluted wine equal to a revi’is.
 - **Rava** says, this can be proven from our Mishna as well. The Mishna says that in general, one may not carry out liquids that are a revi’is. Yet, with regard to undiluted wine, the Mishna says that it may not be taken out when it is the amount needed to make a full cup of wine, which the Braisa says refers to the cup used for bentching, which must be a revi’is. To make a revi’is, one needs one quarter of a revi’is of undiluted wine, which must be why the Mishna considers this amount to be significant. This follows **Rava’s** shita that wine is considered to be wine when there are 3 parts water to every 1 part of undiluted wine.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: Abaye** says, there are 2 reasons why the Mishna doesn't prove that the cup for bentsching needs to have $\frac{1}{4}$ of a revi'is of undiluted wine. 1) A Mishna in Niddah says that if a woman sees blood that is the color of wine that is diluted 2 parts water to 1 part undiluted wine of the Shironi wine, it makes her tamei as a niddah. We see that wine is to be diluted 2-1, not 3-1?! 2) When the person is carrying the undiluted wine, it is only $\frac{1}{4}$ of a revi'is. How can that be considered significant? The fact that it will eventually be mixed with water and made into a revi'is doesn't change the fact that right now it is an insignificant amount!? **A: Rava** answered: 1) Shironi wine is weaker than other wine and therefore only needs to be diluted 2-1. Or we can answer, that Mishna is discussing color, not taste. To get to the color of blood, it can only be diluted 2-1, but for the proper taste it needs to be diluted 3-1. 2) With regard to the second question, that small amount of undiluted wine is itself considered significant, and that's why one is chayuv for carrying it out even before it is mixed with the water.
- **R' Nosson** says in a Braisa, one is chayuv for carrying out congealed wine the size of an olive (because a revi'is of wine congeals into the size of an olive).
 - **R' Yosef** says, **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** says this same concept. A Braisa brings a machlokes where **B"R** say that blood of a "neveilah" is not metameh like the actual "neveilah". **B"H** say that it is. **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** says that **B"H** would only hold that the blood is metameh like the neveilah when it is the size of an olive – the minimum size that a piece of neveilah must be to be metameh. He explains that blood in the amount of a revi'is is equal to the size of an olive.
 1. **Abaye** said, the case of wine and the case of blood cannot be compared to each other. Wine and blood have different consistencies and therefore have different ratios between their solid and liquid states.

CHALAV KIDEI GEMI'AH

- **Q:** Is "gemi'ah" spelled with an "aleph" or an "ayin"? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** answers from a pasuk that it is spelled with an "aleph" ("Hagmi'ini").
 - **Q:** Is "gar'inin" (pits) spelled with an aleph or an ayin? **A: Rava bar Ulla** answers from a pasuk that it is spelled with an ayin ("v'nigra").
 - **Q:** Is "omemos" (glowing coals) spelled with an aleph or an ayin? **A: R' Yitzchak bar Avdimi** answers from a pasuk that it is spelled with an ayin ("amamooohoo").
 - **Q:** Is "me'amtzin" (closing the eyes of a meis) spelled with an aleph or an ayin? **A: R' Yochanan** answers from a pasuk that it is spelled with an ayin ("v'otzeim").
- A Braisa says, if one takes out cow milk, he is chayuv if he takes out the amount of a swallow. If he takes out human milk or the white of an egg, he is chayuv if it is enough to put into an eye solution. If he takes out the eye solution, he is chayuv if it is enough to mix with water.
 - **Q: R' Ashi** asked, if he takes out enough solution to be applied to the eyes, even though it won't all get into his eyes because inevitably some stays on his finger, is that enough to make him chayuv or does he need to take out enough to apply a full amount to his eyes? **TEIKU**.

DEVASH KIDEI LITEIN AHL HAKASIS

- A Braisa explains, this means he took out enough honey to put on top of the wound.
 - **R' Ashi** asked, does there need to be enough honey to go on the entire top part of the wound, or only the very high, top portion? **TEIKU**.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** says, Hashem created nothing in His world without a purpose: a worm was created to heal a wound; a fly was created to heal a hornet sting; a gnat was created to heal a snake bite; a snake was created to heal boils (he takes a black snake and a white snake, cooks them together and puts the mixture on the boil); a spider was created to heal a scorpion bite.
- A Braisa says, there are 5 instances where a stronger thing is afraid of a weaker thing: the lion is afraid of the "mafgia" (a small creature with a loud cry); the elephant is afraid of the gnat; the scorpion is afraid of the spider; the eagle is afraid of the swallow; the "levyasan" is afraid of the "kilbis" (a small fish that kills larger fish by going into their ears).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Zeira** found **R' Yehuda** to be in an especially happy mood. He therefore asked him to explain certain things that he thought he would otherwise not want to answer. He asked the following:
 - Why do goats lead the herd and sheep follow them? He answered it is like Creation – first was dark and then light (goats are black and sheep are white).
 - Why are sheep covered with a tail but goats are not? He answered, sheep provide us with coverings (clothing from their wool) so they get a covering.
 - Why do camels have such a short tail? He answered, because they eat thorns, and a long tail would get caught in the thorns.
 - Why does an ox have a long tail? He answered, because they live in swamplands and need the tail to swat away the gnats.
 - Why are the horns (antennas) of a grasshopper soft? He answered, because if they were hard, when they would bump into the willow trees in which they live, they would break and would go blind.
 - Why is it that the lower eyelid of a rooster goes over the upper eyelid? He answered, because they hang out on top of buildings and rising smoke from the houses would go into their eyes and blind them if their eyelids weren't like that.
 - Why is a door called a "dasha"? He answered, it is a contraction of "derech sham" (the way is there).
 - Why are steps called "darga"? He answered it is a contraction of "derech gag" (the way to the roof).
 - Why is dipping sauce called "maskolisa"? He answered, it is a contraction of "masai tichleh da" ("when will this be used up", because it is a dip and gets used very slowly).
 - Why is a house called a "beisah"? He answered, it is a contraction of "bo v'eisiv bah" (come and sit in it).
 - Why is a small house called a "biksa"? He answered it is a contraction of "bei aksa" (it is a small place).
 - Why is a certain measurement called a "kufta"? He answered, it is a contraction of "kuf v'siv" (turn it over and sit on it – the box that held that measurement).
 - Why are bricks called "livnei"? He answered, it is a contraction of "livnei bnei" (it will last for the grandchildren).
 - Why is a fence made of willows and thorns called a "hutza"? He answered, because it is a simple "chatzitza" (a partition).
 - Why is a barrel called a "chatzbah"? He answered, because it is "chotzev mayim", it draws water from the river.
 - Why is a small keili called a "kuza"? He answered, because people describe it "kazeh" ("like this" measurement that they make with their hands).
 - Why is a hadas called "shutisa"? He answered, because "shitusah" – fools – people dance with it at weddings looking like fools.
 - Why is a washing bin called a "mishichla"? He answered because it is "mashei kulah" (it washes all).
 - Why is a fancy washing keili called a "mashchilta"? He answered, because "mashya kalsa" (a bride washes with it).
 - Why is a hand mortar called an "asisa"? He answered, because it is "chaserta" (it is "missing" because it is a hollowed out piece of wood).
 - Why is a piece that you crush on called a "buchna"? He answered, because "bo v'akena" (come and hit it).
 - Why is a garment called a "levusha"? He answered, because it is "lo vusha" (no embarrassment).
 - Why is a coat called a "glima"? He answered, because it is like a "golem" (it is shapeless, not fitted).
 - Why is a fancy coat called a "gulsa"? He answered, because "galei v'eisev" (he exposes himself when he sits because he lifts it so as not to sit on it).
 - Why is a bed called a "purya"? He answered, because people do "pru u'rvu" on it.
 - Why is a dry water pit called a "bor zinka"? He answered, because "bor zeh naki" (this pit is empty).
 - Why is a head wrap called a "sudra"? He answered, because "Sod Hashem li'rey'av" (and Chachomim wear the head wrap).
 - Why is a palace called an "apadna"? He answered, because "apischa dein" (to this door all must come).
- A Braisa says, 3 animals become stronger as they grow older: fish, snakes and pigs.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

SHEMEN KIDEI LASUCH EIVER KATON

- **R' Yanai** says, one is chayuv for carrying out enough oil to anoint the small limb of a one day old baby.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that one is chayuv for carrying out enough oil to anoint a small limb *and* the limb of a day old baby. This seemingly means the small limb of a grown person *or* the large limb of a baby? **A:** The Braisa means enough oil to anoint the small limb of a one day old baby – it's not two separate cases.
 - **Q:** Another Braisa brings a machlokes as to how much oil one needs to carry to be chayuv. **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says enough to anoint a small limb and a one day old baby. **R' Nosson** says enough to anoint a small limb. Maybe they argue in what **R' Yanai** said: **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says there needs to be enough oil to anoint the small limb of a one day old baby and **R' Nosson** says enough for the small limb of an adult or the large limb of a one day old baby? **A:** The Gemara says, it could be that all argue on **R' Yanai**, and the machlokes is whether the small limb of an adult is the same size as the large limb of a one day old baby. **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says they are the same size and **R' Yanai** says they are not.
 - A Braisa clearly says that **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says one is chayuv for carrying out the amount of oil needed to anoint the small limb of a one day old baby. He says clearly like **R' Yanai**.